



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,474	09/01/2006	Itaru Kanno	33082M341	1445
441	7590	01/05/2011		
SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL 1130 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W., SUITE 1130 WASHINGTON, DC 20036			EXAMINER OSTERHOUT, BENJAMIN LEE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1711	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/05/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,474

Applicant(s)

KANNO ET AL.

Examiner

BENJAMIN OSTERHOUT

Art Unit

1711

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 October 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 5-13 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 5-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-040)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB-08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 1-2 and 5-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication 20030079764 to Hirose et al. (Hirose) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,253,963 to Tachibana.

Regarding claims 1 and 13, Hirose teaches a substrate processing apparatus for cleaning a semiconductor (paragraph 2, ll. 1-3) wherein a two fluid nozzle (Fig. 7, generally, paragraph 47, ll. 1-2) mixes a gas and liquid comprising: a nitrogen gas supply passage (Fig. 7, part 28), a liquid passage for supplying deionized water (Fig. 7, part 27), and an ejection passage formed in a straight shape (lead-out passage, Fig. 7, part 45a) to eject a mixture fluid (paragraph 78, ll. 7-13); wherein the ejection passage

has an opening (port) is formed at the front end of the ejection passage (Fig. 7, near parts 45 and 45a); wherein the cross-sectional area of the ejection of the exit of the nitrogen gas supply passage is smaller than the cross-sectional area of the ejection passage (Fig. 7, near converging arrows and 45a). Hirose teaches an ejection port with a cross-sectional area equal to the ejection passage (see Fig. 7, part 45a) and that the cross-sectional area of the gas supply passage is smaller than ejection port (Fig. 7, part 28 and near part 45a). Hirose does not teach that the cross-sectional area of the ejection port is smaller than a cross-sectional area of the ejection passage and that the cross-sectional area of said ejection port (injection port) is formed constant from an entrance thereof to an exit thereof; or wherein a transition between the lead-out passage and the injection port is step-wise.

Tachibana teaches a nozzle assembly for a syrup drink dispenser (col. 1, ll. 5-7) wherein the nozzle (Fig. 1a, part 2) has an ejection port (Fig. 1a, part 22b) with a constant cross-sectional area that is smaller than a cross sectional area of the spout nozzle/passage leading up to the opening (Fig. 1a, part 22) along with a staged portion (Fig. 1, part 22a) forming a step-wise transition in order to sufficiently mix together the syrup and diluent (col. 7, ll. 43-52).

Therefore it would have been obvious to modify the nozzle of Hirose with the ejection port with a constant cross-sectional area that is smaller than a cross-sectional area of the passage leading up to the opening along with the staged portion forming a step-wise transition as in Tachibana in order to sufficiently mix the gas and liquid thereby properly atomizing said mixture.

Furthermore it is obvious to one of ordinary skill that in optimizing the size of the passages (injection port, supply passage, etc.) the atomization of the liquid may be improved, thereby leading to a better cleaning effect. However, this is merely optimizing the invention. See MPEP 2144.05, Section II, Part B. Furthermore it is clear that the size of the opening will affect the droplet size/diameter and that routine experimentation may be used to discover the optimum droplet size for efficient cleaning

Regarding claim 2, Hirsrose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim

1. While Hirsrose in view of Tachibana discloses the claimed invention except for the cross-sectional area range of the ejection passage to the ejection port is 1: 0.25 to 0.81, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the claimed range of claim 2, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (see MPEP 2144.05, Section II, A).

Regarding claim 5, Hirsrose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim

13. While Hirsrose in view of Tachibana discloses the claimed invention except for the cross-sectional area range of the nitrogen gas supply passage is 1.13 mm² to 6.16 mm², it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the claimed range of claim 5, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (see MPEP 2144.05, Section II, A).

Regarding claim 6, Hirsrose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim

13. While Hirsrose in view of Tachibana discloses the claimed invention except for the

cross-sectional area range of the nitrogen gas supply passage is 1.77 mm² to 4.91 mm², it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the claimed range of claim 6, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (see MPEP 2144.05, Section II, A).

Regarding claim 7, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 1. Hirose teaches that the ejection passage is formed in a straight shape and that the cross-sectional area of the ejection passage is constant (Fig. 7, part 45a).

Regarding claim 8, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 7. While discloses the claimed invention except for a length of the ejection passage is 10 mm to 90 mm, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the claimed range of claim 8, since it has been held that where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, discovering the optimum workable ranges involves only routine skill in the art (see MPEP 2144.05, Section II, A).

Regarding claim 9, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 1. While Hirsose in view of Tachibana disclosed the claimed invention except for a length of the ejection port being 30 mm or shorter it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to use the 30 mm or shorter ejection port, since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art (see MPEP 2144.05, Section II, Part B).

Regarding claim 10, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 1. Hirose teaches that a buffer chamber (liquid introduction passage, Fig. 7, part

44a) has an annular shape and surrounds the nitrogen gas supply passage (Fig. 7, part 28) wherein the nitrogen gas supply passage is coaxial with the ejection passage (Fig. 7, parts 28 and 45a); the liquid supply (Fig. 7, part 27) is opened on an outer peripheral face of the buffer chamber (Fig. 7, parts 27 and 44a); a taper portion is formed with a diameter which gets smaller toward a front end side in said buffer chamber (Fig. 7, part 44a near where arrows converge); the taper portion opens between the nitrogen gas supply passage and the ejection passage (Fig. 7, where arrows converge); and the gas and liquid mix together wherein one of ordinary skill realizes that cleaning solution droplets will be formed.

Regarding claim 11, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 1. One of ordinary skill in the art realizes that the modification as made in claim 1 and the straight shape of the ejection passage (lead-out passage, Fig. 7, part 45a) along with the staged portion of Tachibana will form a vertical cross-sectional shape of an exit side periphery having a right angle.

Regarding claim 12, Hirsose in view of Tachibana is relied upon as above in claim 1. Hirose teaches a spin chuck (Fig. 4, part 71) for holding a substrate horizontal; and a drive mechanism for moving the nozzle comprising a holding arm and guide rail (Fig. 4, parts 77 and 34, respectively).

Examiner's Response to Arguments

4. Examiner has carefully and thoroughly reviewed the amendments and arguments made by Applicant, however, Examiner remains unconvinced.

Applicant's main argument is that Hirose does not teach a step-wise transition from the lead-out passage to the injection port and that the reference to Tateyama does not cure said defects. Examiner agrees with Applicant.

However, due to Applicant's amendment, Examiner conducted a new search and consideration and found the reference to Tachibana which teaches a staged portion (step-wise transition) in order to properly mix the two constituents injected into the nozzle. Examiner realizes that the proper atomization of the mixture is dependent upon creating a tortuous flow which keeps the constituents of the mixture properly mixed; and that Tachibana is concerned with teaching the mixing of two constituents along with keeping them mixed together and that this is accomplished by creating a tortuous flow, hence, the stage portion.

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to BENJAMIN OSTERHOUT whose telephone number is (571)270-7379. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 8:30am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Barr can be reached on (571)272-1414. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Joseph L. Perrin/
Joseph L. Perrin, Ph.D.
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1711

BLO